



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,708	09/17/2003	Michael Allen Bryner	TK3690USNA	4383

23906 7590 08/16/2006

E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY
LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER
BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128
4417 LANCASTER PIKE
WILMINGTON, DE 19805

EXAMINER

PIZIALI, ANDREW T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1771

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/664,708

Applicant(s)

BRYNER, MICHAEL ALLEN

Examiner

Andrew T. Piziali

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 15 and 17-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-14,16,23 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 9/17/03 & 1/16/04 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 6/2/2006 has been entered. The examiner has withdrawn the rejection of claim 3 based on the cancellation of claim 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 13, 14 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US Patent Application Publication 2003/0129909 to Zucker.

Regarding claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 13, 14 and 16, Zucker discloses a nonwoven fabric having a support layer and a barrier layer formed from nanodenier continuous filaments (paragraph 9). The fiber diameter for the infinite length fibers of the barrier layer is preferably less than 500 nanometers (0.5 micrometer) (paragraph 9). The fabric is useful as a barrier in disposable hygiene applications and filtration (paragraph 14). Although Zucker does not explicitly teach the limitations of hydrohead values or Frazier permeability, it is reasonable to presume that said limitations are inherent to the invention. Support for said presumption is found in the use of similar materials (i.e. nanofiber barrier layer) and in the similar production steps (i.e. bonding to a substrate layer) used to produce the nonwoven fabric. The burden is upon the Applicant to prove otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald*, 205 USPQ 594. In the alternative, the claimed hydrohead values and Frazier permeabilities would obviously have been provided by the process disclosed by Zucker because the references specifically teach that the material is made in order to create a barrier layer with improved hydrostatic head (paragraph 9). Note *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 433, footnote 4 (CCPA 1977) as to the providing of this rejection under 35 USC 103 in addition to the rejection made above under 35 USC 102.

With regard to claims 7-9, Zucker discloses using polyolefin in the nanofibers, including propylene and ethylene units (paragraph 10).

With regard to claim 13, Zucker does not teach a solids fraction value for the barrier fabric. As set forth above, it is reasonable to presume Zucker inherently meets this limitation because of the use of similar materials and similar methods. Alternatively, the claimed limitation would obviously have been provided by Zucker because the reference discloses improving

Art Unit: 1771

barrier performance barrier performance and reducing pore size using smaller fiber diameter (paragraph 9).

With regard to claim 14, Zucker does not disclose the basis weight, hydrohead, and Frazier permeability as described in the claimed formula. As set forth above, it is reasonable to presume Zucker inherently meets this limitation because of the use of similar materials and similar methods. Alternatively, the claimed limitation would obviously have been provided by Zucker because the reference does disclose that barrier performance as measured by hydrostatic head and basis weight ratio is improved (paragraph 9).

With regard to claim 16, Zucker discloses the nanofiber barrier layer is bonded to spunbonded support layer (claim 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication 2003/0129909 to Zucker in view of USPN 6,114,017 to Fabbriante et al. (hereinafter referred to as Fabbriante).

Zucker discloses that the basis weight of the barrier layer affects the resulting pore size of the fabric (paragraph 29). However, Zucker fails to teach the barrier layer to have a basis weight within the claimed range. Fabbriante also teaches nonwoven webs comprising nanodenier fibers used in absorbent garments and filters (Abstract). Fabbriante teaches that basis weights of the barrier fabrics may be between 10 and 30 gsm, and that increasing the basis weight improves hydrostatic head (See Tables 1 and 2). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a barrier layer with a basis weight between 20

Art Unit: 1771

and 51 gsm in the fabric of Zucker in order to obtain an optimal amount of hydrostatic head, as taught by Fabbicante.

6. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication 2003/0129909 to Zucker in view of USPN 6,746,517 to Benson et al. (hereinafter referred to as Benson).

Zucker does not teach adding a hydrophobic coating material. Like Zucker, Benson is directed to a fine fiber nanodenier fabric useful in filter media (Abstract). Benson teaches that adding a hydrophobic coating to the nanofibers is preferable, and such a coating is typically fluorocarbon containing (column 12, lines 47-67). It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add fluorocarbon coating to the material of Zucker in order to improve filtration property, as taught by Benson.

7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication 2003/0129909 to Zucker.

Zucker discloses that the finer denier layer creates smaller average pore sizes in the fabric (paragraph 29). While Zucker does not disclose any particular pore size for the invention, Zucker does teach that the prior art barrier layers created pore size distributions in the 7 to 12 micron range and 10 to 15 micron ranges (paragraph 6). Since the aim of Zucker is to produce an improved barrier fabric, it must be assumed that the pore size distribution in the barrier layer is improved over the prior art. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide pore sizes of no more than 23 micrometers in the barrier layer of Zucker in order to provide an improved barrier layer, as taught to be desired by Zucker.

Art Unit: 1771

8. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication 2003/0129909 to Zucker in view of USPN 6,554,881 to Healey.

Zucker uses a spunbonded fabric for the support layer (claim 5) but does not disclose the diameter of the fibers in that layer. Like Zucker, Healey teaches a filter fabric layer comprising fine fiber layer bonded to a support layer of spunbonded fibers (Abstract). Healey teaches that the spunbonded support layer has a fiber diameter ranging from 5 to 15 microns (column 30, lines 64-67). Because Zucker is silent to the diameter of the support layer fibers, it would have been necessary, and therefore obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use spunbonded fibers having a diameter in the range of 5 to 15 microns in order to provide a support layer that is sufficient for filtration purposes, as taught by Healey.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 6/2/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Zucker does not contain an enabling disclosure as to sub-micron nano-denier continuous fibers. Applicant asserts that Zucker points to Fabbriante as enablement to making continuous filaments with diameters less than 1000 or 500 nm; and that Fabbriante only discloses discontinuous fibers in that range. The examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, as now admitted by the applicant (see page 6, second to last paragraph), Fabbriante does disclose continuous filaments of 0.5 microns. Fabbriante provides a specific example comprising a mixture of continuous and discontinuous fibers having a diameter of 0.5 microns (column 9, lines 22-49). The Applicant asserts that this is not relevant because the amended claims recite the barrier webs consist only of continuous fibers. The examiner

Art Unit: 1771

respectfully disagrees. It is clear that Zucker teaches making continuous filaments within Applicant's claimed range and Fabbicante provides an enabling disclosure as to the making of nanodenier continuous fibers so a person of ordinary skill in the art could practice the invention of Zucker.

Second, as now admitted by the applicant (see page 7, first paragraph), Zucker teaches the nano-denier continuous filaments may be made splitting multi-component fibers rather than direct spinning (paragraph 18). Zucker specifically mentions the teachings of USPN 5,225,018 to Zeldin and USPN 5,783,503 to Gillespie. Fabbicante is not the sole source of enablement. In response, the applicant asserts that Zeldin is silent regarding fiber diameters and therefore Zeldin cannot enable the claimed nano-denier fibers. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The applicant has failed to show, or attempt to show, that the method of Zeldin cannot enable one skilled in the art to make the claimed nano-denier filaments. The applicant also asserts that the method of Gillespie cannot enable Zucker's fibers because Gillespie only mentions 0.1 denier fibers. Once again, the applicant has failed to show, or attempt to show, that the method of Zeldin cannot enable one skilled in the art to make the claimed nano-denier filaments.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 1771

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew T. Piziali whose telephone number is (571) 272-1541. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on (571) 272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

atp

gtp 8/11/06
ANDREW T. PIZIALI
PATENT EXAMINER